

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 693

EA 018 440

AUTHOR Rutherford, William L.; And Others
TITLE School Management, School Development, School Improvement in the United States (and) New Light from an Old Lamp: Castleton High School. Report No. 3201.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 62p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Administrators; Case Studies; Change Strategies; *Educational Administration; Educational Change; Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Principals; Urban Education

IDENTIFIERS Castleton Public Schools PA

ABSTRACT

Two distinct but related topics, addressed by different authors, are covered in this report. William L. Rutherford's contribution, entitled "School Management, School Development, School Improvement in the United States," reviews the building administrator's role in school improvement within the broader context of educational administration. The report first outlines the organizational features typically found in American school systems and individual schools. Administrator's roles and responsibilities, their selection and training, and their typical activities are described next. The report then looks at trends in school improvement and considers the administrator's role in educational change and the social and professional expectations affecting the administrator's involvement. The second contribution, by Sheila C. Murphy and Shirley M. Hord, reports on the findings of a case study of an administrator's process for reawakening school pride in an urban Pennsylvania high school. Entitled "New Light from an Old Lamp: Castleton High School," the report does not cover the study methodology, but instead describes the school's characteristics and the administrator's management techniques. These techniques included interpreting district policies creatively, involving supportive staff members in specific projects, avoiding direct confrontations with those in formal authority roles, using persuasion rather than confrontation, and maintaining a constant vision. (PGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED268693

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

School Management, School Development,
School Improvement in the United States
and
New Light From An Old Lamp:
Castleton High School

William L. Rutherford
Sheila C. Murphy
Shirley M. Hord

Rep. No. 3201

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

1985

EA 018 440

We wish to acknowledge the effective school leadership demonstrated by Walter Scriven of Germantown High School in Philadelphia, who served as the source for some of the ideas contained in this paper.

The research described herein was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

School Management, School Development,
School Improvement in the United States
William L. Rutherford

A: Main characteristics of educational and administrative systems

Typically public education in the United States begins at the kindergarten level for children aged 5 and continues through the twelfth grade. For these thirteen years of schooling the grades are grouped into three different school levels. Each level is situated in a separate building that is located some distance (perhaps 1 kilometer) from the buildings for the other levels. Kindergarten through grade 6 students attend elementary schools, students in grades 7 and 8 are in junior high schools, with the remaining four grades in senior high schools. Although this is the most common pattern of structuring schools, it is certainly not the only pattern. Increasing numbers of school systems are developing middle schools, schools that focus on grades 5 through 8. Grades 5 through 7, or 6 through 8 may be placed in a middle school. The placement of grades 6-7-8 in the middle school seems to be preferred by principals and parents.

In the systems that include elementary, junior and senior high schools the junior high school is organized much like the high schools. For each subject, students have a different teacher and move to another classroom. One purpose of middle schools is to provide an easier transition from elementary to senior high school by including features of both units in the scheduling and assignment of students and teachers. Currently middle schools are increasing in number around the nation and it seems this trend will continue for the next few years.

Another change that will surely occur in some public school systems in the next decade is the provision of schooling for children below the age of five years. Vast numbers of these young children attend private day care centers each day because public schools typically do not have a pre-kindergarten (age 5) program. Many parents would like for public schools to accept children at younger ages but to do so will be quite expensive and will probably require an increase in taxes. For this reason, the movement will be gradual.

Administratively, schools are guided and controlled at four levels, local school, school district, state and federal governments. Schools within a city or a community are formed into a school district. Each school district has a school board that is composed of elected community members who set policy. The board employs a superintendent who is the chief administrative officer for the school district. State boards of education and state legislatures establish basic policies for the operation of all schools in the state. Graduation requirements, specific time allocations for teaching certain subjects, number of days of schooling per year, number of hours of schooling per day, financial support of school districts and textbook selection (in some states) are some of the policy decisions made at the state level.

Federal government policies do not directly influence the schools in as many ways as the state; but when they do, they have a definite impact. For example, the federal government mandated bilingual education and appropriate education for all students with special educational needs. These actions, along with judicial decisions requiring school integration, have necessitated local school compliance. Failure to comply may result in loss of funds for the school or school district.

In recent years a greatly increased number of policy decisions are being made at the state level and this is likely to continue. This trend creates increasing conflict between the state and local schools and school district autonomy. However, in spite of all the policies impinging on the local schools from higher authority, there remains much opportunity for individual schools to change and improve. Relationships between school improvement and local school management are addressed in the next section.

B: Management of and in schools

B1: Description of management of and in schools

Ultimate responsibility and authority for management of the local school is vested in the school principal. In most schools this individual has no teaching responsibilities and is obligated full time to administrative service. Depending on the size of the school, there will be one or more assistant principals who serve as full-time administrators under the principal. Often elementary schools are served by a principal only, but the trend is to place assistant principals in more elementary schools. Few junior high and senior high schools would not have at least one assistant principal. At the high school level each of the subject areas will have a department head (also called department chairman) who has been formally assigned to that position. No similar position exists in elementary schools.

Though school principals are by design and in fact the managers and responsible authority in the school, they do not function independently; in one manner or another they rely on others to assist them. Formation of leadership teams is one way they organize for assistance, especially in high schools. The management team may include the principal and assistant principals (also called vice principals), or it may include others such as the

head counselor, the student activities director and/or the attendance officer. Department heads may also be a part of the management team.

At the elementary level there is less likelihood there will be a management team, particularly if there is no assistant principal. However, elementary principals will informally rely on teachers or others to assist with leadership and management. This is not always done in a planned, systematic way, but it seems to occur in all schools.

No matter how a school organizes for management and leadership, the primary responsibility of the principal is to ensure that conditions exist within the school wherein learning can and does occur. They are to make certain that the faculty carries out their instructional responsibilities in an appropriate manner. Principals are responsible for scheduling the school day, assigning teachers their particular teaching responsibilities, determining that the required curriculum is taught, and that all formal policies are respected.

Currently school management is made quite difficult by the large number of new policies that are being dictated by state boards, policies that are often ill defined and not easily implemented. As a consequence, teachers also must spend greater amounts of time responding to these mandates, thus leaving them less time (and flexibility) to initiate their own improvement efforts.

Most of the new policies are directed at improving student performance as determined by achievement test scores, a current national priority. As a part of this priority, more emphasis is being placed on principals serving as instructional leaders within the school. Unfortunately, the role of instructional leader is not well defined and many principals feel ill prepared to assume this role.

In some schools the principal and assistant principal(s) share all responsibilities for school management and in others there may be a clear separation of responsibilities. For example, the assistant may have responsibility for all student discipline affairs while the principal attends to curriculum matters. When there is more than one assistant principal, duties may be divided three ways. No matter how duties are divided, the principal retains ultimate responsibility for all that happens in the school. However, when there is a clear delineation of responsibilities each administrator can carry them out more or less independently. At both high school and elementary levels the responsibilities of the assistant are determined for the most part by the principal. The number of assistant principals in a high school will vary according to size of the student body, but it will usually be no more than two or three.

Secondary schools also have department heads that share in school leadership. Their role differs from that of principals and assistant principals in several significant ways. They have no line authority and their responsibilities are limited to their own subject center. In some schools the heads share in the evaluation of teacher performance but in the majority of situations the heads attend only to logistical matters such as scheduling and provision of materials and supplies for their teachers. Department heads are not often the key initiator or facilitator of school improvement efforts.

B2: Selection of school management positions

There are two different phases of selection of school principals. A first phase in the selection process is that of choosing as a principal an individual who has never previously served in that role. It is this initial phase that will be described in this paper. The second phase of principal selection is the reassignment of a principal from one school to another school

within the same district. In districts with many schools, it is quite common that each year a portion (perhaps as many as 25%) of the principals will be assigned to a different school.

Records are not available, but it is probable that nationwide more principals are reassigned each year than are employed as first-time principals. Though this is true, very little is known about the rationale or criteria that guide these changes. Neither is there information about the impact of these changes on schools and on the principals. Because so little is known about this second phase of principal selection, it cannot be discussed.

Becoming qualified for the position is the first step in initial principal selection. Having several years of experience as a classroom teacher is one of the qualifications. In addition, to become qualified an individual must complete a university program designed specifically for the training of school administrators. The program may lead to a master's degree, thus it occurs after one has completed a bachelor's degree. Basic requirements for the university program are usually established by the state education board which grants administrator certification upon program completion.

Once an individual has been qualified to serve as a principal, he or she applies for positions that are available and then waits (and hopes) to be chosen for a principal's position. Authority for selection of principals resides in each school district and is exercised by the school superintendent with approval of the school board. What are the steps in the selection process and how are they executed by the district? A recent study by Baltzell and Dentler (1983) describes a typical selection process.

This study identified five steps in the process: 1) declaring a vacancy; 2) stating the criteria for selection; 3) development of a pool or list of applicants; 4) screening of the candidates; and 5) deciding who will be employed.

At the first stage, the vacancy announcement, a contradiction in the selection process appears. Community members, school board members and school superintendents all agree that the position of principal is very important to the quality of a school, yet vacancy announcements typically are distributed only within a local area. This limits the search to qualified candidates in that area and excludes individuals outside the area who might be even better candidates and may be willing to move to the area.

Statements of the criteria that will be used for the selection of a principal always begin with the requirement of state certification as a principal and, in some cases, they may add additional academic criteria, such as university courses in special education or bilingual education. Beyond this, there are few, if any, specific criteria identified. The decision makers who hire principals speak of the importance of being a good leader, but rarely are any specific descriptors given to describe good leadership.

Although they are never articulated as written statements, the criterion that seems to have the greatest influence is the norms of the local culture. Decision makers have an image of the kind of person the community would most like to have as a principal. This image is based, not so much on leadership criteria, as on personal factors such as personal grooming, moral character, an ability to understand and communicate with the type of persons the school serves, or his/her commitment to activities (such as sports) that the community values.

Understanding of the third step in the process, formation of the applicant pool, requires some discussion of the career ladder leading to the principalship. Most principals or candidates for the position begin as a teacher or as a coach of some athletic activity. By their performance in those positions, particular teachers may show promise for school leadership and be encouraged by their principal or supervisor to acquire the training needed for certification. As they go through the university training program, they will probably continue to teach and will take on more responsibilities within the school in an effort to enhance their image as candidates for a principalship.

When the training program is completed and state certification is granted, the individual may enter the applicant pool and seek to be considered for a position of principal. Because there are usually a number of applicants for every vacancy, it may be several years before a qualified candidate is selected to be a principal. Many individuals who have certification are never chosen, for the number of available candidates is always larger than the number of vacancies.

The path to the principalship does not, in the majority of cases, go directly from teaching or coaching to a principalship. Assignment to a position as an assistant principal for a period of years frequently precedes a principal assignment, but it does not guarantee a principal appointment. In a limited number of cases a person may move from classroom teaching to a position of supervisor or curriculum coordinator at the school district level and then into a principal's position. Certification requirements for assistant principals and supervisors are usually very similar, if not identical to those required for the principalship.

Screening of candidates (step 4) will always be in two phases and, in some cases, more. First, there will be a review of the individual's resume and application, and then there will be formal screening interviews. These interviews can range from individual interviews conducted by just a few of the top staff members of the district and the superintendent, to group interviews in which parents, teachers, principals, and assistant principals participate. From these interviews the interviewers will provide some form of evaluation of the candidate, and rankings if there is more than one, to the superintendent. With this information in hand the superintendent then conducts the final interview.

The decision regarding employment is made by the superintendent. Superintendents recognize this decision to be an important one for the school, the school district and for their own success within the district. Thus, they make this decision with great care, still it is more likely to be based on the norms and culture of the community than on a specified set of leadership criteria.

Other than the principal and assistant principals, the only other formally identified management positions in the local school are heads of the subject centers. In some districts many have considerable management responsibilities and may receive a salary close to that of the assistant principal. However, these situations are few; most of the time they have limited management responsibilities and receive meager rewards.

One significant contribution to the selection of school leaders that has occurred during the past decade is the development of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center. These centers, which are appropriate for all levels of school administrators, have three basic components. First, there are twelve identified skill dimensions that

relate to the most important characteristics of successful principals and assistant principals. Second, simulation techniques and exercises have been developed to provide information for evaluating individuals relative to the twelve skills. Finally, an excellent program to train the assessors who staff the center has been developed .

Each year there is an increase in the number of school districts that use an NASSP Assessment Center in the principal selection process. Furthermore, a professional development component is being coupled with the screening function in some Centers which increases their value to schools.

B3: Professional development of school managers

Initial training of school managers is conducted only in universities. This training begins after the student has completed a Bachelor's degree and typically leads to a Master's degree and certification by the state as qualified to serve as a school administrator.

The content of a training program must meet certain minimal requirements set by the state; but beyond that, program requirements will vary, sometimes considerably, from university to university. A program offered by a leading university will serve as an example of the requirements students must meet. Forty-five semester hours are required to be certified as a school principal. Thirty of these hours must be taken in the Department of Educational Administration and include courses such as the Structure and Organization of Public Schools, Administrative Functions in Education, Organization Theory in Education, Seminar in Instructional Supervision, and Administration of the Individual School. Additionally, students must take a course in curriculum organization and three courses in related academic areas outside the Department of Educational Administration.

Instructional procedures in the Department of Educational Administration include simulation, guided observation, clinical studies, lecture and an internship. In this university the student must spend one semester, full time, working with a principal in a school as a way of gaining practical, supervised experience. Among educators the school-based experience is generally accepted as being quite valuable, yet this type of internship is more of an exception than the rule in university training programs.

How effective are the training programs for school managers? There are no formal or commonly accepted measures or evaluation criteria for judging program success. Two evaluation techniques that are frequently employed are: 1) to count the number of graduates that are placed in administrative positions, and 2) to survey graduates for their perceptions of the value of the program.

Placement rates may vary considerably depending on the number of students graduated, the population area served and the reputation of the university program and its faculty. For instance, many of the graduates of the program described above go directly into administrative positions, perhaps as an assistant principal or supervisor. Other universities in the state may have a much lower rate of immediate or delayed placements because they do not have the reputation for a quality program.

Characteristically, administrator training programs are evaluated negatively by graduates. Recently, a noted professor of educational administration commented that graduates from their university really hated their program. This feeling seems to be widespread, as indicated by various survey studies. One study (Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968) found that fewer than two percent of the respondents felt their university training program contributed to their success as elementary school principals.

Exactly why graduates are so displeased with their training is not known for certain, but from a review of the literature, Pitner, Riley and Giduk (1981) advance the notion that it may be due to discrepancies between training programs and actual demands of the job. They describe four such discrepancies. First, students in the university are in a subservient role and a role in which they use a technique of avoidance to resolve student-teacher or peer conflicts. As school managers, they move from a subservient role to a superordinate position, and they find collaboration rather than avoidance is a more effective technique for addressing conflicts.

Second, it has been reliably documented that the work of managers (Mintzberg, 1973), including school managers (Morris, Crowson, Horowitz and Porter-Gehrie, 1981), is conducted through brief, disjointed encounters, mostly verbal, with a variety of people in relation to a variety of needs. Quick decisions are frequently required in response to face-to-face situations. Training programs do not prepare one for this type of behavior. Instead, students are asked to give careful consideration to all possible problem solutions before making a decision.

The process of work in schools, particularly regarding problem resolutions, is conducted through face-to-face communication; but at the university students are likely to do much of their communicating via writing.

Finally, in training programs students are encouraged to be thinkers, dwelling on ideas and rational approaches to task accomplishment. As a school manager, the principal finds that the demands of the job often do not permit contemplation and rational planning. Undoubtedly, many university professors who train school managers would disagree with these propositions, but alternative explanations for the negative student evaluations of training programs are not readily available.

If university training programs do not adequately prepare school managers for their work, then the question must be asked, "Where and how do they learn to be a school manager?"

It is possible this occurs as result of inservice training but that seems doubtful. There are many opportunities for inservice training for school managers conducted by state departments of education, local school districts and regional education agencies. While they range in length from a single afternoon, to weekly three hour sessions, to two days before school starts, to one to two week summer institutes, most programs are short in duration, do not include follow-up activities with participants and do not assess impact on principal performance. One exception to this is the Principal's Institute developed by Peterson and associates at the George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University. This institute seeks to improve the skills and knowledge of its participants in those areas known to be essential to effective leadership. The knowledge base is drawn to a great extent from research findings on the characteristics of effective schools.

Participants (limited to 25) begin the Institute with a demanding three week course of study during the first summer followed by a year-long project in school improvement carried out by the participants when they return to their own school. The next summer there is an optional week-long advanced institute on the university campus. Unlike the negative ratings of many principals training programs, participants in this program rate it very highly.

As mentioned, a training component is being included in some of the NASSP Assessment Centers to assist school leaders to acquire the skills assessed in the Center. This development is promising for the continuing education of principals. Unfortunately, the number of principals who have access to

quality training such as that offered by Vanderbilt, the Harvard Principals' Center (NIE Directory, 1982) which operates on a weekly basis offering development opportunities and functions on the teacher center model, and the NASSP Centers is quite small.

Those principals who begin their administrative work as assistant principals have much opportunity to learn from the principal. Since many principals do serve first as assistant principals and often in more than one school and under more than one principal, it may be here that they learn how to serve as a principal.

Research during the past decade has produced conclusive evidence that the school principal has a significant impact on how effective the school is in terms of student outcomes. These findings have served to further elevate the importance of the principal in the opinions of the public and educational decision makers. This research has brought about greater emphasis on the evaluation of principal performance. It has also brought about some changes in university training programs, but they have been subtle and uneven across the many training institutions. These program changes have brought more emphasis on practical, reality oriented experiences and they encourage students to select courses from a wider variety of disciplines.

In the recent national commission and committee reports calling for reforms in American schools there was very little attention directed to the preservice or inservice education of principals or to their selection and evaluation. While there is national recognition of the contribution of school principals to school effectiveness, there is no national push to change the procedures for training and developing them. Therefore, it seems unlikely there will be any significant changes in these practices in the near future.

B4: School management in action

There is probably no such thing as a typical day in the life of a school principal, nor is there any one principal who would be typical of all other principals. Nevertheless, there are several studies of the work of school principals that provide insights into the daily work of principals. In his classic ethnographic study, Wolcott (1973) studied intensively the work of one elementary school principal. This principal served an elementary school that Wolcott believe to be not atypical of other elementary schools.

Table 1 presents a categorization of the various activities of the principal in Wolcott's study and the percentage of time devoted to each of those activities.

From these data it is apparent that there is considerable variance from day to day within an activity category, as well as significant differences between categories when several of the categories are considered together, i.e., in the first four categories, it was determined he spent approximately three-fourths of his average day in the presence of others.

Table 2 reveals how the principal spends that portion of time when in the presence of others. As the table shows, that time was divided almost equally between listening and talking. When talking, the principal was usually sharing information of some kind.

Another area investigated by Wolcott was the different groups of people the principal spent time with and how much time he spent on the average with each. Table 3 presents those data. Approximately 70% of his time was spent with adults or students located within the school and 30% with persons outside the school.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) studied four elementary and four secondary principals and found, as did Wolcott, that they had many face to face encounters with others. However, these eight principals did not allow the

problems of others to consume them and detract them from their personal vision for the school.

Howell (1981) conducted two survey studies of school principals to determine how they spent their work time. A first survey was of 14 principals of middle schools and junior high schools and it asked them to indicate how they used their time on one specified day. The tasks on which they spent their time and the percentage of time spent, on the average, are shown below.

Paper work	33%	Teacher supervising	7%
Parent conferences	14%	Discipline	10%
Personnel conference	14%	Cafeteria supervision	10%
Scheduling	10%	Instructional leadership	2%

It cannot be known for certain, but if the three tasks of instructional leadership, teacher supervision and personnel conferences were all directed at improving the effectiveness of teachers and the school, the principals were directing approximately one fourth of their efforts specifically at school improvement and three fourths toward management or administrative efforts to keep the school operating.

Investigators of the work behaviors of high school principals (Martin and Willower, 1981) and elementary principals (Kmetz and Willower, 1982) produced findings similar to those of Howell. Principals at both levels spent approximately 60 percent of their work day in scheduled and unscheduled meetings and desk work. Elementary principals spent more time on instructional matters than did their secondary counterparts and their day was not so hectic.

To gain additional information about the work of school principals, a second and larger survey was conducted by Howell (1981). The intent of this survey was to elicit more specific information about instructional leadership

activities as well as activities in six other areas. This survey included 82 elementary principals, 54 middle and junior high school principals, and 31 senior high school principals. Table 4 summarizes the results of the data reflecting how principals reported they spent their workday.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the results is that all three groups spend significantly less time on instructional leadership activities than on administrative activities. A second finding of interest is that none of the principals reported they conducted staff development as a way of providing instructional leadership. A third finding that should be noted is that the one responsibility that consumes the most time for principals in each group is office responsibilities. Senior high principals report that they spend less time with office responsibilities and more time with student relations than do principals in the other two groups. This may be because they typically have more personnel to assist with office work.

This latter finding is consonant with the findings from a study conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Byrne, Hines & McCleary, 1978). A national sample of senior high school principals was asked to describe a typical week of work by placing in rank order nine areas according to the amount of time devoted to each area. The rankings derived from the survey in order of time spent were: 1) school management, 2) personnel, 3) student activities, 4) student behavior, 5) program development, 6) district office, 7) planning, 8) community affairs, and 9) professional development.

When asked where they should spend their time, these same principals ranked program development first, personnel second and school management third. Time with the district office was ranked last.

Specific information about the work of assistant principals is not available, but it is likely there would be some similarities and some differences in the way they allocate their time. Assistant principals will work as many hours per week as principals, and typically they will be consulted on major decisions affecting the school. They will also share the responsibility for assisting and evaluating teachers and monitoring the curriculum. As is the case with principals, their day will be characterized by many brief, disjointed, face-to-face encounters with students and adults.

At all school levels, but particularly in secondary schools (junior and senior high schools), the assistant principal usually is assigned responsibility for student discipline. Assistants will have less contact with district office personnel, parents and community, but they may have more contact with student groups. In some schools the assistant will have responsibility for program development. This is especially true in senior high schools where there may be assistants with a job description that assigns them this specific responsibility. Regardless of their school level or assignment of responsibilities they are clearly assistants to the principal, and their work behaviors must have his/her sanction.

Many school principals are subjected to no formal evaluation of their performance. When it does occur, it will usually be conducted by the superintendent or members of his staff. Rarely will teachers or parents participate in either formal or informal evaluation of a principal. These constituencies may hold opinions about the performance of the school leader, but unless that leader is grossly incompetent, those opinions are not likely to influence his/her job security. Principals may be transferred to another school but rarely are they ever dismissed.

C: School management, school management-development and school improvement

C1: Some major school improvement trends in recent past and/or near future

Without a doubt the most influential trend in American education today is popularly termed "back to the basics." While this movement has different meanings to different people, most everyone understands that it means, at least, to improve student skills in reading, written communication and computation. Further translated it typically means that schools are expected to bring about continuing increases in student scores on achievement tests.

In response to the "back to the basics" emphasis many actions are being taken by the various states. Many states are mandating additional courses in English, math and science and some universities are increasing foreign language requirement for entering students. Because of these new requirements many college-bound students have the opportunity to choose only a very few elective courses and the total number of elective courses has been sharply reduced in the past few years.

Stricter school attendance requirements and reduced emphasis on extracurricular activities (sports, musical and drama activities, debate team, etc.) are two additional actions that many states and schools are taking in an attempt to raise the academic performance of students. Students are permitted fewer days of absence from school and the penalties for exceeding the limit can be severe. Most extracurricular activities continue in schools but attempts are made to schedule them so as not to interfere with academic classes.

The "back to the basics" movement has also focused attention on the competency of teachers. An increasing number of states are requiring university students to pass an examination prior to entering a teacher

preparation program and another upon completion of the program and before receiving certification to teach. A few states have plans to test all persons who are currently teaching. Those who do not pass the competency test would no longer be permitted to teach. As might be expected there is much opposition from teachers to this plan.

Also happening are attempts to provide differentiated salary schedules for teachers either through merit pay or career ladders. It is the intent of this trend to encourage teachers to make improvements in their teaching skills and to remain as active teachers rather than leaving the profession.

During the past decade there has been another significant change in schools but it has not received so much public notice as "back to the basics." In the 1970's there was a time when student freedom was the key word in education. Students led demonstrations to get the freedoms they wanted and schools responded by relaxing dress codes, behavior standards, attendance requirements and academic standards. Those were hectic days for teachers and students and created an adverse climate in schools. Today schools are very regimented and student freedoms are much more restricted. Teachers and students alike seem to appreciate this and in the view of many teachers school climate has improved in the past few years.

It is true today, and it has been so for the last two decades, that the favored approach to school improvement has been through curriculum change. Efforts to improve schools by changing methods or didactics have been relatively few. Many new textbooks have been written to incorporate the latest research findings, and hundreds of new curriculum programs have been developed across all curriculum areas. This has been especially true for elementary schools.

Each one of the new programs has been developed to address a particular learning need or problem that students are experiencing. The greatest number of programs have been directed at reading instruction and at students from poor home backgrounds who characteristically experience more difficulty with academic achievement than students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. While some of these new programs expect that teachers will use very different methods, many only require the use of different curriculum materials. Those programs that do require change in teaching methods are much more difficult to implement and are not so widely disseminated.

One possible exception to this is the instructional skills program for improving teacher effectiveness developed by Dr. Madeline Hunter. This program is being introduced into many schools at all levels. There is no curriculum associated with the program, only techniques and procedures for improving teaching and learning and an elaborate staff development program that involves Dr. Hunter and her staff, as well as facilitators at the school district and local school level. The scope of the program is quite broad, with a promise to improve teacher efficiency and effectiveness, student learning and student behavior. Because of its many components, it is estimated that five years will be required to fully implement it in a school. Just now it is not possible to assess the effectiveness of the program for it is so recent on the educational scene that few schools have had the opportunity to implement it fully. In fact, it is not yet known how many schools that have begun the program will actually implement it.

Another school improvement effort that is occurring throughout the nation is the introduction of computers into school for the purpose of teaching computer literacy and promoting computer-assisted instruction. It would be rare to find a school that does not have some kind of computer initiative

underway. However, involvement with computers is much more spontaneous than planned at this time. Few schools or districts have a planned program with clear objectives for the computer initiative.

Efforts to improve schools may be initiated within a school by teachers or school leaders or they may come from outside the school, e.g. the school district, the state or federal agencies. Changes that affect an entire school are much more likely to come from outside the school than from within. This is especially true of high schools. Changes that originate within the school are more likely to influence a subgroup of teachers, such as primary grade teachers or mathematics teachers, rather than an entire faculty.

When improvement efforts come to a local school from outside agencies, responsibility for facilitating the change will typically rest with an external change agent or the school principal. Someone within the school will usually be the facilitator of a change that begins in the school.

Support and facilities for school improvement efforts may come from several sources depending on the nature of the change. Individual schools have only very small sums of money they might use for improvement efforts. Therefore, if the effort requires special facilities, personnel, materials or monies, support must be obtained from the school district or some other external source. If the improvement effort comes to the local school from the district or other outside agency, the needed support will likely be provided to the school by that agency.

C2: Role of school management in school improvement

If not stated forthrightly, it is always assumed that the school principal has primary responsibility for what happens within his school. In some school districts this responsibility is made quite explicit. For example, in some districts it is made very clear by policy that the school

principal is responsible and will be held accountable for student outcomes as determined by achievement test scores. When school scores meet or exceed expectations, the principal and school may be granted additional support, but if the scores are less than expected, the principal may be subject to reassignment or penalty in salary.

While there are very few districts that place these kinds of expectations on principals, it is universally expected that the principal will take whatever actions are necessary to ensure that their school is always improving. The principal is the chief school improvement officer in each school. Unfortunately, what is expected of principals regarding the promotion of school improvement and what they actually do is more often discrepant than it is congruent. Of the total number of changes that are introduced into a school as a means of bringing about improvement, only a small percentage are initiated by the school principal.

Most changes in the local school for the purposes of improvement are initiated by the state or the school district. Some of these changes come in the form of policy decisions. For example, the state may require higher standards for graduation from high school, or the school district may require that the school day be extended by 15 minutes in order to provide more learning time. In the case of top-down policy decisions, the school principal will be certain that the changes are accomplished in his or her school.

Many of the changes that come from the district (and a few from the state) are not policy changes but curriculum changes, that is, they propose the use of different teaching materials or learning objectives. Because these changes come from the district down to the school, they are considered top-down improvement projects. However, in many instances the changes are in response to needs expressed by teachers, and a representative group of

teachers are involved in the development of the project. When this type of district or state initiated change is introduced into the local school, the school principal may respond in one of three ways. One response is to give the improvement effort his/her active and enthusiastic support. When the principal does this, there is much greater probability the change will be implemented and institutionalized.

A second kind of response would be to oppose the change, usually covertly, in which case the change is not likely to be implemented. Only a small number of principals will respond in this manner. A larger number give the first kind of response, but the number of principals that will give either of these responses does not represent the majority of school leaders.

The majority of school leaders will simply sanction the improvement effort without enthusiasm or active support. These principals expect that facilitation of the change effort will be provided by an external change agent or by someone within the school. (More will be said about these facilitators later.) Where principals respond this way, school improvement efforts in schools are likely to be only partially implemented if at all.

School improvement efforts that influence an entire school are more likely to come from the top down, but certainly there are many improvement efforts that may begin with an individual or group within the school and the school as a whole may decide on the change. (One note of clarification--even when the change is bottom-up, there are very likely some within the school who disagree with it and feel it is imposed just as if it were top-down.)

Bottom-up changes are subject to the same three responses from the school leader as are top-down improvement efforts. Few, if any, bottom-up efforts will even emerge if it is known that the principal does not welcome or encourage them. In schools where the principal permits improvement efforts

but remains neutral toward their implementation, various changes may be introduced, but only a limited few will endure. Chances of an improvement being implemented are greatly enhanced if the principal is openly and actively supportive of it.

Clearly a school leader can and does have a significant influence on school improvement and this influence may be negative, neutral or positive. Research conducted at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin (Rutherford, 1984) has determined that there are five characteristics that mark those school leaders who have the most positive influence on school improvement.

First, they have a certain vision of the improvements that are needed and possible in their schools. Second, they convey this vision to the school faculty as goals that can be attained. Also, they hold these goals as expectations for the faculty to meet. Following this, these school leaders will provide the support and the resources necessary to accomplish the expected improvement. A fourth characteristic of the positive school leader is that they monitor with care the implementation effort. Finally, based on information gained through monitoring, these principals take any corrective actions needed to help the improvement effort succeed.

Regardless of whether the improvement is top down or bottom up, these characteristics of positive school leadership increase the probability of successful implementation. When the change is bottom up, the acceptance by teachers is usually enhanced and this can increase collaboration in the school. This may change the nature of the school leaders' work, but it does not alter the need for positive actions by the principal.

Important as the principal is in school improvement, she/he does not facilitate implementation alone. In a study of nine elementary schools that

were engaged in school improvement, researchers at the Texas Research and Development Center found that in every school there was at least one person other than the school principal who shared in the facilitation of the improvement (Hord, Stiegelbauer & Hall, 1984). These individuals, termed Second Change Facilitators, may be an assistant principal, a teacher with special skill related to the particular improvement effort, a curriculum specialist within the district, or some change agent external to the district.

Regardless of the position of the second facilitators, they are not independent but serve as sanctioned by the principal. Nevertheless, they are nearly as active as the school leader in making interventions to support the improvement effort. These second facilitators frequently come into their role in an informal manner, and usually they serve in that role for a specific improvement effort. As the focus of school improvement changes a new second change facilitator will emerge.

School improvement is definitely more successful when the school leader makes it known that he/she supports it as a high priority and acts to facilitate it but he/she does not facilitate implementation alone.

C3: Expectations and evaluations

Specific expectations of various interest groups for school leaders will vary from community to community and even from school to school within a community. Parents of children in one community may expect that the principals will have a rigid dress code for students in the schools, while parents from another school expect a flexible dress code. One community may place much emphasis on support of school athletic activities while another community may deemphasize athletics and emphasize other kinds of extracurricular activities.

These types of specific expectations for a school or a community may be expressed directly to the school principals or other professional staff members within the school by parents. Or parents may express their expectations to the school superintendent or members of the school board. Frequently these specific expectations represent cultural/social norms for the community and they do not change from year to year.

While school managers must be aware and responsive to these school-specific expectations, they are much more influenced by a broader set of expectations that is common to most schools. Peterson and Wimpelberg (1983) refer to dual imperatives that place pressure and demands on principals. These they call the technical imperative and the political imperative.

The technical imperative includes most of the work commonly assigned to the school leader, guiding the teaching and learning process, maintaining a safe, clean and orderly environment, prompt completion of all required paperwork, proper accounting for any funds allocated to the school, participation in required school district meetings and teacher evaluations.

A political imperative is one that would not be so closely related to the teaching-learning process in the school as the technical imperative. It requires that the principal establish a climate within the school and community that causes the community to be satisfied, if not supportive, of the school. Effective public relations or community relations are terms often used to describe the political imperative.

When it comes to their performance evaluations, school leaders recognize the importance of the political imperative. During extensive interviews with 113 elementary school principals, they were asked what criteria they believed their superiors in the school district office would use to evaluate their work

(Peterson & Wimpelberg, 1983). The criterion mentioned most often by the principals reflects a political imperative--parents are happy with the school and are not complaining.

Other studies have attempted to determine what factors influence the work of school principals. In a national summary of senior high school principals (Byrne, Hines, & McCleary, 1978) the respondents were given a list of interest groups and asked to rate each group according to how much impact it has on the operation of the schools. The five interest groups rated as having the greatest influence were: 1) athletic-minded persons (especially alumni); 2) state teachers' organizations; 3) citizen or parent groups; 4) the business community that employs students or graduates; and 5) religious or church groups. As in the Peterson and Wimpelberg (1983) studies, these findings show the perceived importance of the political imperative on the work and evaluation of school leaders.

In yet another aspect of the national survey of senior high principals (Byrne, Hines, & McCleary, 1978) the principals were given a list of 18 conditions and asked to indicate which ones interfere with the successful completion of their job. These 18 conditions are listed in Table 5, and next to each one is the percentage of principals who believe that condition to be an obstacle. Lack of time, support and facilities are top among the factors perceived to be major obstacles.

Gmelch and Swent (1982) had more than 1000 administrators at the school and school district level rate 35 items according to how much stress they create in their professional lives. Table 6 shows how school leaders (principals and assistant principals) of senior and junior high schools and elementary schools ranked the 12 factors that caused them (the group as a whole) the greatest professional stress.

Principals and assistant principals did not all agree on the most stressful factors, but there are some similarities to be noted. "Complying with rules," "resolving parent conflicts," and "attending meetings," were the factors that created the greatest stress, while factors such as "too heavy work load" and "expectations on self" were not so stressful (remembering these were the top 12 stressors out of 35). Regarding staff evaluations, principals are somewhat more stressed by this responsibility than assistant principals. This may be because in some schools the principal does more of the teacher evaluations, and in all schools the principal has the ultimate responsibility. School principals are formally evaluated by district office superiors, if they are formally evaluated at all. Such an evaluation could lead to reassignment to another school, but rarely is a school principal demoted out of a principalship or fired. In this sense the evaluations of principals are not particularly threatening. Nevertheless, principals are aware of their ultimate responsibility for what happens in their school and that the school is responsible to many teachers, hundreds of students, many more parents and community members, and to school district officials. The influence of all these groups does create job stress. Gmelch et al. (1982) found that 60 percent of the school leaders they surveyed reported that at least 70 percent of the stress in their lives came from their jobs.

How do school leaders cope with this stress? Gmelch et al. (1982) found from their research that they employed three ways of coping. More than 50 percent engaged in some kind of physical activity as a way of reducing stress, and approximately 40 percent employed some type of mental control. This includes maintaining an optimistic attitude, sharing problems and seeking advice from others, taking time for relaxation and maintaining a sense of humor.

A final way school leaders had of coping with stressful influences was termed management skill development by the researchers. However, fewer than 10 percent of the school leaders mentioned use of management techniques as a coping technique. Those management skills that were mentioned were time management, good human relations, conflict management, delegation of responsibilities and collaborative problem solving.

It would be interesting to know why so few school leaders rely on management skills as a way of coping with the pressures of their job. Unfortunately, this research does not provide any insights into this question. Perhaps school leaders feel they are already employing good management skills so they must rely on other techniques such as physical activity and mental control to cope with the multiple influences on their job. Another explanation could be that they do not receive assistance in assessing management skill needs or in developing better skills. Either or both of these explanations are plausible, for typically school leaders receive little or no feedback from others regarding their specific management skills and they have limited opportunities for training in management skills beyond what they receive in their university training program.

C4: School management development and school improvement

School managers are dissimilar in their capability for managing school improvement. From a series of studies of school improvement in elementary schools, researchers at the Texas Research and Development Center discovered three different principal styles of managing school improvement (Hall, Rutherford, Hord & Huling, 1984). These facilitating styles are described below:

Responders place heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They see their primary role as administrative;

they believe that their teachers are professionals who are able to carry out their instructional role with little guidance. Responders do not articulate visions of how their school and staff should change in the future. They emphasize the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others. Before they make decisions they often give everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh their feelings or to allow others to make the decisions. A related characteristic is the tendency toward making decisions in terms of immediate circumstances rather than in terms of longer range instructional and schools goals. In this sense they remain flexible and willing to make last minute changes in decisions.

Managers represent a broader range of behaviors. At times they appear to be very much like Responders and at other times they appear to be more like Initiators. The variations in their behavior seems to be linked to how well they understand and buy into a particular change effort. In general they see to it that basic jobs are done. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teacher needs. When they learn that the central office wants something to happen in their school they see that it gets done. However, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the basics of what is imposed. Yet, when a particular innovation is given priority they can become very involved with their teachers in making it happen.

Initiators seize the lead and make things happen. They tend to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be like and work intensely to attain this vision. Decisions are made in relation to the goals of the school and in terms of what is best for students, not necessarily what is easiest or will make teachers the happiest. Initiators have strong expectations for students, teachers and themselves. When they feel it is in the best interest of their school, particularly the students, Initiators will

seek changes in district programs or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school.

When school improvement efforts were assessed in the study schools, it was found that schools with Initiator principals were most successful, followed closely by those with Manager principals. Responder principals were less successful in managing school improvement. Furthermore, the climate of the schools as judged by the teachers was most desirable in schools with Initiator and Manager principals and less desirable in schools with Responder principals.

From the research it was not possible to explain exactly how the school leaders differed in their knowledge and skills for managing school improvement. There were, however, apparent differences in the amount of activity and energy they gave to intervening, or supporting and assisting teachers, and in their attitudes. Initiator principals, and to some extent Manager principals, believed it was their responsibility to manage school improvement and to ensure its success. Responder principals sanctioned school improvement efforts, but they did not seem to believe it was their responsibility to manage them. They tended to leave that to others within or outside the school.

Are there developmental activities for school managers to strengthen their capabilities for improvement management? Models for school improvement management such as the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hord & Loucks, 1980; Hord, Hall, Huling-Austin, Rutherford & Stiegelbauer, 1984) and Organization Development (Schmuck, Runkel & Arends, 1977) are available, and principals can be taught how to utilize them. Unfortunately, few are so taught. University training programs have a responsibility to prepare school leaders to perform those tasks necessary to keep schools operating smoothly, day to day. This

leaves inadequate opportunity to prepare school leaders for managing change. Training priorities will have to shift or programs will have to be extended if school improvement skills are to receive greater attention.

Many states and school districts require that teachers spend a certain number of days per year in staff development activities. In these same districts or states there may be no requirement regarding staff development for school principals. This does not mean that they have no staff development opportunities, but it does reflect the relatively low priority assigned to development activities for school leaders.

In school districts with a number of schools it is common that principals will meet as a group at least on a monthly basis. These meetings are often conducted by the school superintendent or by members of his staff. These meetings are usually devoted to discussion of administrative tasks and problems, not management of school improvement.

There are some notable exceptions to the lack of principal training for the management of school improvement. School districts that are implementing Madeline Hunter's approach to school improvement often begin by training school leaders to train teachers and manage the improvement effort within the schools. Accompanying the program are some very explicit print and media materials to be used by the school leaders in training others. When school leaders do participate in developmental activities to strengthen their capability for improvement management, more often than not the activities are related to a specific improvement effort rather than to development of generalized improvement management skills.

The need for more professional development opportunities for school leaders related to school improvement is clear. From professional organizations and from some states and school districts there are indications

that increased opportunities will be available in the future. It is only during the past decade that findings from research on the work and importance of school principals have accumulated to the point of permitting a confident statement about the importance of the principal to school improvement. Based on numerous studies, it is now known that how much or little improvement occurs in a school is directly related to how the principal manages improvement. These findings are changing the perceptions of what the role of school leaders should be.

For some years literature in the field of educational administration has acknowledged that principals do have a responsibility to provide instructional leadership. However, after World War II schools had to cope with the growth brought on by the post war "baby boom" and then with the pressures for greater student freedom that sparked the demonstrations and rebelliousness of the late 1960's and early 1970's. During these years the maintenance of a safe and orderly school became a much higher priority for school leaders than instructional leadership.

During the same years President Lyndon Johnson succeeded in passing historic legislation that focused national attention on schools and schooling, especially on the educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children. This legislation resulted in a massive infusion of dollars, materials and special personnel into the public schools of our nation. So great was the influence and impact of this federal initiative, school leaders (and teachers) were virtually overwhelmed with financial and logistical management of these many programs. Although these programs have had immeasurable consequences, they did not really encourage school leaders to serve as leaders for school improvement. Instead, principals had to spend great amounts of time

responding to the paperwork and regulations required to procure, distribute and monitor the resources available from the federal government.

During the past decade many schools have had decreasing enrollments, there have been drastic cuts in federal support for public education, and the earlier emphasis on student freedom has shifted to student responsibility and academic achievement. From the general populous has come the cry for a return to the basics, meaning greater emphasis on academics in schools. As a result of these recent shifts, schools are being asked to do a better job of educating students, but with fewer resources. Consequently, the need for school principals to serve as leaders for school improvement has emerged as a priority role responsibility. This, in turn, could lead to professional development activities that would better prepare them to fulfill those responsibilities.

D: New Light from an Old Lamp: Castleton High School

Sheila C. Murphy and Shirley M. Hord

It sits in the middle of a part of town where most people wouldn't want to go after dark. Traveling toward the school during early daylight hours, local colleagues continuously remind visitors to lock car doors. From the outside, it appears like other urban schools in deteriorating neighborhoods, once quite grand, now suffering poverty and decay. On closer inspection you notice that, although it is enclosed by a chain-link fence, common in settings of American urban decay, there are no broken windows and there is even a hint of grass. At the school's entry stands a huge green door, and when you enter you are greeted not by drabness and graffiti but by huge, bold murals, some abstract, some realistic, all celebrating pride in school and in black and American heritage. The setting defies the myth that American high schools are unfriendly, unsafe, and threatening places (Hord, 1984).

Castleton High School is an urban school, both like and unlike other American high schools. It is unlike many others because it is in an inner city, low socioeconomic area which manifests a unique set of problems not found in more affluent areas. In the demeanor and dress of students and faculty, it is very much like many others as the Castleton students dress neatly, in the same peer fashions currently popular in all high schools. The faculty are dressed a bit more formally than in many other high schools, and suit and tie seem to be the unofficial male uniform and the women wear "dressy" slacks or dresses. The faculty tries to model pride in dress for the students. The principal extends this modeling by roaming the halls and reminding students when their dress or conduct is not acceptable, "Hey, we don't wear our hats in the house." While these examples set by faculty and administration are not terribly unusual, they are evidence of the pride that

has been instilled in the school's environment. Through dedication and vision, Castleton High is overcoming the negative image that was associated with it and with other similar schools in large urban areas.

D1: The National Context

The United States has 235 million people, widely dispersed throughout 50 states, of whom some are more than 4,000 miles apart. Its economy has been stagnant for nearly a decade, but there is growth in the technological, service and professional sectors. Though some increased power over educational policy, regulation and control of curricula has gone to the states (which finance, on the average, 47% of education costs while the Federal government's share is only 9%), most day-to-day educational decision-making is carried out at the level of the municipality. There are 16,000 different municipal, or local, school districts in the U.S.A., which levy taxes from their local communities, and each has substantial autonomy to define and carry out its program, subject to broad state and federal regulations. There are also private schools, which enroll 11% of students, but they receive little support beyond the tuition their students pay.

A National High School Study. High school researchers from the Research on the Improvement Process (RIP) program at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE) visited Castleton as part of their exploration of U.S. high schools, some that were actively engaged in a great deal of change and some that were experiencing very little change. Some of these schools were facing rapid growth and other schools were struggling for survival because of declining enrollments. District enrollments at the eighteen study schools visited ranged from 1,000 in the state of Kansas to 200,000 in the state of Pennsylvania; school enrollments from 317 to 2,500.

The minority student population ranged from 1% in Kansas to 99% in Pennsylvania and Texas.

Two R&D researchers visited Castleton and each high school to gain as much understanding as possible about the school and the change activity taking place in the schools. They interviewed principals, assistant principals, department heads, teachers, students, counselors, student activity directors, athletic and music directors, curriculum coordinators and central office staff. The principals who were interviewed in the study ranged from two to 26 years of experience in their role and managed faculties ranging in size from 22 to 135. The study focused on understanding the types, sources, and purposes of change in high schools, the key units of change, the key situational factors that influence the change process, and how the change process is managed in high schools. For complete technical details of the design of the study see Huling-Austin (1984).

D2: Background of Castleton

The Castleton section of Philadelphia was once a productive and affluent agricultural community. As Philadelphia expanded and absorbed Castleton, those who were financially able moved away to the new suburbs. Castleton High School was located in the middle of this transition neighborhood, and as integration became a reality in the district, the high school student population became all black. During the rebellious years of the late 1960s and early 1970s, already noted, Castleton High gained a reputation for dangerous gang activity. The principal explained, "Here at Castleton we have had some problems with our image in the community. Historically the school was a predominantly white school. It changed overnight. In less than a year it went from predominantly white to a 99% black school." When asked to detail the "overnight" transition, he stated, "It happened by loopholes within school

district policy. We have what you call a 'designation of authority,' and kids were able to escape across school boundaries to leave the Castleton attendance area. You have to recognize that this was occurring during the heated late part of the '60s. There was a lot of student unrest and a question of safety developed about the school; the school flipflopped overnight."

Simultaneously, the community around the high school declined and since the high school and the area are known by the same name, the school became connected with any and all negative publicity generated in that area of town.

"During the latter 60s and early 70s, just before I became principal here, there were a lot of gang activities, and that was the community memory of the school. We constantly pay a penalty simply by our name, Castleton High School. For example, a newspaper headline read: Two Policeman Shot in Castleton. For half the people who heard that, it was Castleton High School, even though it actually happened in the community of Castleton not the high school." In this climate, Will Shriver entered as principal of Castleton High School, a place where no one -- students, teachers, or parents -- wanted to be.

D3: Managing Castleton High School

Day-to-day Management. The business of running Castleton High School has become routinized. The day-to-day management scheme runs like a well-oiled machine with each component carrying out specific functions which complement all the other parts. Everyone from the principal through the students has a clear picture of the chain of command. With the principal, the assistant principals serve as colleagues in the daily decision making processes. In fact, the two assistant principals are clearly in charge of certain areas and the principal expects them to act independently, although he provides critical feedback when actions do not meet expectations. Will Shriver purposefully

grooms the assistant principals in all the roles of principaling so they may be promoted to a full principal's position. He has taught them everything he knows, consequently they share the same philosophy and values. He considers it a positive reflection on himself when his assistant principals are chosen for top administrative positions. They work cohesively, meeting often to discuss issues in order to take action and to maintain a united front.

A cabinet, composed of the three top administrators, the department chairs, and faculty representatives meet regularly to discuss governance and administrative issues. They are a planning and decision advising group, and serve as a second tier, the larger representational administrative team for the school. In this role they respond to teacher suggestions and student requests. They discuss problems and generate solutions. This formal "team" is in place and effective. Students and faculty are able to articulate its structure, identify its effectiveness, and utilize it appropriately.

School Improvement Management. School improvement takes place outside of the formal administrative structure. The principal is clearly the focal point for school-wide improvement. Typically, he initiates change by exploring existing resources, creatively reshaping them to serve his purposes which could result in reassigning a staff person to become a "major mover." He does not work immediately with the entire faculty, but identifies and fashions a key catalyzer and builds the change process around a few persons. He devotes little energy to converting the negative influences and even less with the large neutral majority.

Will Shriver carefully picks his battlefields, enlists his cadre of activists, initiates the effort, and moves into action. He has his own priorities and personally engages in them. He is clear on his expectations of

others. He does his job and expects others to pursue theirs with a similar dedication.

An opportunist of sorts, he has an uncanny ability to selectively actualize his staff, while meeting organizational goals of a high order. He quietly and efficiently utilizes his own strengths and the strengths of his staff to upgrade and improve his school. His driving goal is a vision of Castleton High as a stimulating place for learning.

D4: School Improvement/Stages of Implementation

While others in the school, the department chairpersons and central office personnel, dealt independently with subject areas of school improvement, this principal took on a school-wide improvement, the school's climate. To do that, he initially and specifically concentrated on a school beautification program. Esthetic building changes constituted only 2.4% of the kinds of changes identified by Rutherford (1984) in the RIP High School Study, which may be an indicator of this principals unique approach to school improvement.

Vision. When the principal was assigned to Castleton, it had a dismal reputation. He was convinced that improving and enhancing the school as a workplace would stimulate pride in the school, the old reputation could be overcome and the school would, once again become a place of learning rather than a place of fear. He had a vision of the high school as an attractive, appealing place with people who wanted to be there, who liked being there, who would be proud to tell their friends about "their" school. When this could become established, then attention to instructional programs on a school-wide basis could begin in earnest. He articulated this when he said, "I think Castleton is a school that has commenced movement on the academic level. I think we have resolved or routinized those things that you have to do in a

school to make a school attractive, orderly, and ready for work. We have moved now to additional goals that are attainable for us and that are visible. I think that is key in the school. You have to look at your resources and you have to say what it is that you can do and really get a feeling of satisfaction and accomplishment from, then build on that in program areas. These are the kinds of things that in the last three or four years we have made gigantic strides in doing. That's why I feel pretty good about our school and where it's going." On a more concrete level, the principal explained the value of the murals. "I live here. We live here. It should be an attractive facility. That [murals] is important as a signal of successful action, and we can now move with energy into the program areas."

Conceiving a vision or vision building, coupled with the definition of school-wide goals to address the vision, is one key dimension of Shriver's effectiveness. Shriver's ability to translate his vision into clearly defined elements understood by all community members, is another key to his effective facilitation of the change process (Hall & Guzman, 1984).

Initiation. School improvement can be thought of as consisting of stages -- initiation, mobilization, implementation and refinement (van Velzen, Miles, Ekholm, Hameyer & Robin, 1984). In this story, the principal's actions are organized by these stages. For the initiation of the improvement process, the principal utilized "policy reinterpretation" and "creative insubordination" to get his plans underway. He felt such rule bending was defensible as a means to a reasonable school improvement end, to obtain the necessary initial funds to start work toward his vision. To explain, funds were provided to the school for a summer recreation program, funds that were expected to be spent on athletic equipment and crafts materials. Although the walls of the school were in disrepair and marred by an accumulation of graffiti, no funds were

available for their improvement. To bring these two factors into alignment, the principal read the summer program activities guidelines, "reinterpreted" their intent and allocated funds to be spent on paint and brushes, step ladders and other supporting materials. More funds were subtly redirected as needed to launch the program he had in mind.

Mobilization. The principal engaged the assistant principals, a few teachers, and a few students in the first summer "recreation" project that involved running up and down on the ladders and creatively applying paint to the walls, that transformed a few feet of dilapidated wall into a vibrant mural. This was only the first step in a long range plan to enlist more people and transform more walls. Shriver encouraged more people joining in on Saturdays and summers, as the murals became a hallmark of the school. "There are many kinds of ways and things in which we can excel. One of the areas we decided to use here in this school was the real art talents of our students. As we tour the building I'll kind of show you what we have done. The work around this building is student work. We have been able to do things to display their abilities."

Implementation. The repair work on the walls continues as an ongoing activity in the school. The walls are occasionally marred by graffiti, but the building has been transformed and, importantly, the new climate has resulted in new norms. Shriver constantly searches for "extra" money to fund the creation of murals; all the walls have not yet been enhanced. The activity has been an integral part of the summer's activities for several years. The numbers of students and faculty who are actively engaged in the project has slowly increased as the principal continues to solicit more participation and as they have seen the benefits of the project. As pointed out by the principal, the murals are a source of pride. "You'd be astonished

at the number of kids who come in here before school starts or in the summer to bring friends who are visiting to show off their school. To show off the art work."

Refinement. As Will Shriver pointed out, the change of the building facility and climate is simply the beginning of a larger vision, the creation of an environment suitable and stimulating for learning. The existence of the murals and the dress of faculty and students are two visible signs that the climate at Castleton High School has changed toward the positive. This change of climate has fostered the learning environment of Will Shriver's vision, and school-wide emphasis is now being placed on consistency in the program areas. Shriver admits "program building...is a long, slow process. If it is really to have impact, it's got to be done in a systematic way."

To foster consistency and direct attention to academic skills in the program areas, Shriver has taken a page from the elementary administrator's handbook, that is, he is using an activity that is more typical of elementary schools. Each month he selects a skill in one of the academic areas that will become the focus of every teacher and every student's attention. "I give them worksheets on skill-of-the-month, and then we use it. We introduce it to all teachers. We have developed a kind of uniformity with focus on programs." The use of this strategy is another small step in Shriver's vision of commencing "movement on an academic level, developing a consistency in the program areas."

D5: Interest Groups

Because the principal chose to form an informal management group for school improvement rather than utilize the existing formalized management structure, he was able to effectively "circumnavigate" any developing opposition. Since the opposition was unable to target a specific structure

through which to protest, they directly addressed Shriver, who was able to defuse their concerns. However, except for two groups, most interest groups were neither actively negative nor actively supportive, and Shriver saw the majority disinterested population as greatly advantageous because it reduced the negative numbers that might have demanded his immediate and direct attention. Shriver only experienced direct negative interference from two sources, the district central office and the building union group. However, he used very different strategies to deal with each cluster.

When addressing the problem of dealing with the district central office, Shriver said "pressure doesn't bother me. I grew up in this school system. For certain things, I think you have to take it. I came from downtown [the central office] to this position. I know all the people down there and we have a kind of relationship. I understand what their heat really is about and therefore it doesn't impact me in a devastating way that you might imagine." When asked to describe how he avoids unwarranted "heat," Shriver explained that avoidance was neither possible nor expected. He faces the issues that central office raises and is concerned about. This is done in face-to-face interviews in the downtown office where intense discussions may occur over district policies or decisions that are not useful or that are counterproductive to Shriver. Some confrontations he wins; some he loses. But he counts more of his scores in the win column than in the losses column. Overall his confidence and his successful performance as principal help him to maintain a balanced perspective. "I would say it's a fair assumption that they [central office personnel] respond to heat also. If the system-wide federation is bringing up each month on their agenda with the superintendent a particular problem or school, they have an obligation to check it out. They're constantly on that." In other words, pressure from central office

personnel is an expected norm and rather than being frightened by it or reacting to it, Shriver simply views confronting it as part of the pressures of the job.

Shriver employs the same methods and attitude in dealing with the building union representatives. He allows criticisms to roll off his sturdy back, although with the building committee his relationship is expressed in a different manner from central office skirmishes. Shriver perceives the union committee as the source of most of his problems in the school improvement process. "Well, actually I think most of the heat was generated internally. We have a structure here where we have a union, a building committee, and a building representative. The people that I selected for certain jobs [dealing with improving the climate of the building] were not favorites [of the union]. When you're not favorites of the group, it becomes a constant source of irritation. I think that probably created the external pressure." Because he has to "live" with the union representatives on a day-to-day basis, Shriver handled their grievances more formally than those of central office personnel.

The principal met regularly with the building committee which represents the local teachers' union. By contract, all school matters must be referred to this committee for discussion. The principal attended the meetings and followed correct protocol, however he frequently ignored the suggestions of the committee. In effect, through contract negotiations, the union exercised control over issues concerning number of hours taught, pay for extracurricular duties, etc., but they did not directly influence the principal's decision making about school improvement. Because he realized their potential as a political body, he followed protocol in order to protect himself from unwarranted attacks.

On the whole the local community, parents, teachers, and students neither supported nor inhibited Shriver's early efforts to improve the building and subsequently the climate. As the murals unfolded and evolved, segments of these groups became active supporters of the project. Indeed, success bred success and more students and teachers became active participants in the painting process. This enthusiasm reached into the community through contact with the local news media.

The local news media contact was, in reality, another effective intervention created by Shriver. He used his creative management strategies again to broadly interpret personnel policies of the district, rearrange fiscal resources and assign an existing staff person as a half-time school public relations (PR) specialist. This PR person used this time to ferret out stories of good things happening at Castleton, write about them in positive ways and provide the prepared text to the local newspaper. In fact, "we were able to establish a relation with local newspapers and city-wide newspapers to the extent that on any given week in our community papers we may have had seven or eight articles. And when you start to hit people with good things, I am sure that we have had an impact on some of that deep seated belief that our school is a disruptive, wild place which it isn't. We are carrying forth that position this year." Indeed, a local newspaper has continued to carry lengthy stories about the positive changes occurring at Castleton High School (Loeb, 1984).

Parents have been seen as roadblocks to effective change efforts (Hord & Rutherford, 1985). Additionally, the perceptions of the local community can influence the atmosphere for acceptance of change. In fact, the image of the entire school district may be linked to community perceptions of the local high school (Hall, Hord, Rutherford, & Huling, 1984). However, at Castleton

the principal has been able to neutralize the negative effects of parents and community by creating a positive school image. Overall, the support shown in the community is a sign of acceptance of the change.

D6: Main Dilemmas

While some of the problems of this story are unique to Castleton High School, such as this union's particular influence, the major dilemmas facing Will Shriver in school improvement are similar to those facing U.S. schools throughout urban areas that serve lower socioeconomic, inner city populations. In general terms, each major dilemma can be classified as either a lack of human resources or a lack of fiscal resources.

When Will Shriver became principal of Castleton human resources both outside and inside the school were not ready to become actively involved. Parents and the general community lacked any sense of ownership for the school. They did not know what went on at the school and most did not care to know. Parental indifference was demonstrated by their lack of interaction with the school. Parental indifference was contained in a community generally negative about the high school. Anything the community perceived about Castleton High School was "bad."

Inside the school, the situation was not much better. Many students were either part of gangs or victims of their activities. Disrespect was apparent not only in the way property was treated, but also by the way people were treated. Teachers stood by helplessly, immobilized by their lack of efficacy. Coupled with an inadequate availability of energized human resources was a marked lack of fiscal resources. The school district is a large one whose overall budget can be described as modest, at best. Money was available to replace shattered windows and for minimal maintenance; however, no funds were available to paint the dilapidated, graffiti-covered walls. Money was not

available to enlist outside human resources to supply the energy for the few in Castleton who might be willing to step forward.

In essence, there was no extra money. There was a negative community attitude. There was a feeling of powerlessness by teachers. There was a gross disregard for order and authority by a few students and a feeling of hopelessness in other students. No one wanted to work or attend school at Castleton High.

D7: Strategy Analysis

Will Shriver realized that a crumbling, inner-city school with a reputation as a disruptive place was not going to be transformed overnight into an ideal learning environment. Thus, he articulated the portion of his vision which was aimed at an immediate, visible problem -- the building facility. Shriver knew this tactic was only one skirmish in his game plan for providing a place where students and faculty could learn, a place of which all groups, within and without the school, could be proud. Shriver's plan of improvement for Castleton High School contained a number of strategies.

1. He reinterpreted policies to acquire money that would be used for the good of the school. Shriver said the budget had to be dealt with "through creativity."
2. He chose his battlefield and his support personnel carefully. He chose to go around formal school management roles and deal with people who he thought would most readily buy into his vision. Shriver estimated that approximately one-fourth of the faculty would actively support him. He constantly enlisted their advocacy and ignored the quiet majority and the complaining minority.
3. While choosing specific people outside of formal roles to aid in his school improvement plan, Shriver was careful not to confront those

entrenched in formal management positions. He purposefully did not antagonize those residing within the formal structure. He listened carefully, adhered to required protocol, and totally ignored any of their efforts to tamper with his vision of school improvement.

4. Because of the negative attitudes both within the local community and within the school community, Shriver used persuasion rather than confrontation to initiate action. He began an active, positive, nonthreatening project aimed toward raising school pride. In initiating his program, he carefully selected specific promising students and faculty members to join him. He orchestrated his school improvement project carefully, in order to insure its success. His modest first effort acted as encouragement to initiate his more far-ranging vision.

Pervasive Themes. Three clear themes emerge from these strategies: know your enemy and take a calculated risk. Shriver roamed his building and knew the students and faculty. His experience at the central office prepared him for the pressure levied from that source. He acknowledged the power of negative influences, specifically the union, and then worked around them. He knew what to expect from each segment. Using this information he took educated risks in order to provide the fiscal and human resources necessary to mobilize his vision. Shriver's risks were based on a clear assessment of the problem, the context, the bureaucracy. They were calculated risks taken to create the best promise of success. His final theme, in a word, is hold to your vision.

References

- Baltzell, D. C. & Dentler, R. A. (1983). *Selecting American school principals: A sourcebook for educators*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.
- Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives in school leadership*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon
- Byrne, D. R., Hines, S. A., & McCleary, L. E. (1978). *The senior high school principalship Volume I: The national survey*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Department of Elementary School Principals. (1968). *The elementary school principalship in 1968*. Washington, DC: National Education.
- Gmelch, W. H., Koch, J. L., Swent, B., & Tung, R. (1982). What stresses school administrators -- and how they cope. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Gmelch, W. H. & Swent, B. (1982). Management team stressors and their impact on administrators health. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Hall, G. E. & Guzman, F. (1984). Where is the leadership for change in high schools? A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L. & Huling, L. L. (1984). Change in high schools: Rolling stones or asleep at the wheel? Educational Leadership, March 1984, 41(6), 58-62.
- Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., & Huling, L. L. (1984). Effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41, 22-29.
- Hord, S. M. (1984). Facilitating change in high schools: Myths and management. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Hord, S. M. & Loucks, S. F. (1980). A concerns-based model for the delivery of inservice. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.
- Hord, S. M. & Rutherford, W. L. (1985). Dogs can't sing? Good news, a dash of optimism and high school change. The High School Journal, in press.
- Hord, S. M., Stiegelbauer, S. M. & Hall, G. E. (1984). How principals work with other change facilitators. Education and Urban Society, 17(1), November 1984, 89-109.

- Hord, S. M., Hall, G. E., Huling-Austin, L., Rutherford, W. L. & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1984). Leadership for change: Effective leadership development training program. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.
- Howell, B. (1981). Profile of the principalship. Educational Leadership, 38, 333-336.
- Huling-Austin, L. L. (1984). Collecting data in high schools: Methods and madness. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Kmetz, J. T. & Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary school principal's work behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 62-78.
- Loeb, V. (1984, September 24). At Germantown high, a new climate for learning. The Philadelphia Inquirer, pp. 1B, 3B.
- Martin, W. J. & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17, 69-90.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper and Row.
- Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Horwitz, E. Jr. & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1981). The urban principal: Discretionary decision-making in a large educational organization. Chicago, IL: College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.
- NIE Directory of Inservice Training Programs for Principals (1982). National Institute of Education, Program on Educational Policy and Organization, School Management and Organization Studies, Washington, D.C.
- Peterson, K. D. & Wimpelberg, R. K. (1983). Dual imperatives in principals' work. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Pitner, N. J., Riley, M. R., & Giduk, G. A. (1981). Training of the school administrator: State of the art. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.
- Rutherford, W. L. (1984). Change or no change: Kinds and types. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Rutherford, W. L. (1984). Effective school principals: An expose. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.
- Schmuck, R. A., Runkel, P. J., Arends, J. H., & Arends, R. I. (1977). The second handbook of organizational development in schools. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

van Velzen, W. G., Miles, M. B., Ekholm, M., Hameyer, U. & Robin, D. (1984).
Making school improvement work: A conceptual guide to practice.
International School Improvement Project, Centre for Educational and
Research and Innovation, Organization for Economic Co-operation and
Development. Leuven, Belgium: Acco.

Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principals office: An ethnography.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRINCIPAL'S TIME DURING AN "AVERAGE" SCHOOL DAY, 8:00 A.M.-5:00 P.M. (BASED ON A SAMPLE OF 12 2-HOUR PERIODS OF OBSERVATION DURING A TWO-WEEK PERIOD)

Activity of Principal	Observed Day-to-Day Range (in Percentages)	Percent of Time in an "Average" Day
Prearranged meeting or conference	13-35	26
Deliberate but not prearranged encounter	24-29	25
Casual or chance encounter	10-28	15
Telephoning	7-10	9
Talking on intercom	6-15	1
Alone and stationary (e.g., working in his office)	13-24	15
Alone and enroute (e.g., going to a meeting, walking down a hall)	7-14	<u>9</u>
	TOTAL	100

TABLE 2

LISTENING AND TALKING BEHAVIOR OF THE PRINCIPAL DURING AN
 "AVERAGE" SCHOOL DAY (8:00 A.M.-5:00 P.M., BASED ON A SAMPLE
 OF 12 2-HOUR PERIODS OF OBSERVATION DURING A TWO-WEEK PERIOD)

Category	Observed Range (in percentages)	Percent of Time in an "Average" Day
<u>Time Spent Alone</u>		
Portion of total day	20-38	24
<u>Time Spent with Others</u>		
Portion of total day spent		
a. with others without verbal interaction (e.g., "supervising" children on the playground)	5-7	6
Portion of total day spent		
b. <u>listening</u> to others	28-39	35
c. <u>talking</u> to others:		
Giving information	23-27	25
Asking questions	4-8	7
Giving directions	2-5	<u>4</u>
Total Talking		<u>36</u>
	TOTAL	101

TABLE 3

WHO THE PRINCIPAL INTERACTS WITH DURING AN "AVERAGE" SCHOOL DAY, 8:00 A.M.-5:00 P.M., BASED ON ALL INSTANCES OF INTERACTIONS RECORDED DURING A SAMPLE OF 12 2-hour PERIODS OF OBSERVATION DURING A TWO-WEEK PERIOD.

Category	Numbers of instances when interaction was recorded (60-second intervals)	Percent of total time spent interacting with each category
Teachers, individually	187	16.3
Teachers, collectively	67	5.8
(Subtotal, all interactions with teachers, 22.1%)		
Counselor	146	12.7
Other professional staff	81	7.1
Secretary	49	4.3
Other nonprofessional staff	48	4.2
(Subtotal, interactions with teachers, plus all other staff, 50.4%)		
Pupils, individually	160	14.0
Pupils, small groups	46	4.0
Pupils, entire class or school	15	1.3
(Subtotal, all interactions with pupils, 19.3%)		
Student teachers and cadet teachers	12	1.0
Other principals	89	7.8
Central Office (superintendent or assistant superintendent)	2	.2
Central Office personnel (other than superintendent or assistant superintendent)	70	6.1
Parents	79	8.5
Other adults in community	15	1.3
Others	63	5.5
TOTAL INSTANCES RECORDED	1187	100.1

TABLE 4

A PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON MAJOR FUNCTIONS
BY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Role	Elem.	Mid/JHS	Senior
<u>Instructional Leadership</u>	n=82	n=54	n=31
Classroom supervision	(10)	(25)	(10)
Teacher evaluation	(10)	--	(10)
Staff development	--	--	--
Scheduling	--	--	--
Planning	(10)	--	--
Selecting materials	--	--	--
Testing/Evaluation	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>
total	30	25	20
Office responsibilities	40	45	30
Community relations	5	0	5
Student relations	10	10	20
Extracurricular supervision	5	5	10
Personal/Professional development	5	5	5
Faculty relations	5	10	10

TABLE 5
POSSIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE ROADBLOCKS*

Time taken up by administrative detail	90
Lack of time	86
Variations in the ability of teachers	84
Inability to obtain funds	79
Apathetic or irresponsible parents	79
Problem students	76
Insufficient space and physical facilities	66
Inability to provide teacher time	59
Tendency of older teachers to frown on new methods	56
Defective communications	54
Teacher tenure	50
Compulsory school attendance	50
Collective bargaining agreement	41
Longstanding traditions	40
Superintendent or central office staff do not measure up to expectations	38
Lack of district-wide flexibility	35
Lack of competent office help	24
Student body too large	20

* the numbers represent the percentage of principals who consider the factor to be a roadblock.

TABLE 6
TOP STRESSORS BY ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION AND SCHOOL LEVEL
(in rank order)

STRESSORS	High School		Junior High		Elem.
	P	AP	P	AP	P
Complying with rules & regulations	1	3	1	3	1
Attending meetings	2	2	2	7	2
Completing paper work	6	10	5	5	3
Gaining public approval	3	11	10	8	5
Resolving parent conflicts	5	5	4	1	6
Evaluating staff's performance	4	13	3	10	4
Affecting lives of people	8	6	6	9	7
Too heavy work load	10	8	9	12	10
Expectations on self	11	9	12	11	8
Telephone interruptions	9	7	10	13	9
Outside school activities	7	1	8	4	12
Student discipline	15	4	7	2	11
No. of respondents	123	120	88	66	54

P = Principal

AP = Assistant Principal